

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Richmond Division

JEREMIAH LARENZ MOUZON,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) Civil Action No. 3:23-cv-101-HEH
)
)
STACEY KINCAID, *et al.*,)
)
Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM OPINION
(Dismissing Defendant for Lack of Service)

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, brings this action. Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m), Plaintiff had 90 days to serve the defendants. Here, that period commenced on September 18, 2024. More than 90 days elapsed, and Plaintiff had not served Defendant Fary. Accordingly, by Memorandum Order entered on January 29, 2025 (ECF No. 41), the Court directed Plaintiff, within twenty (20) days of the date of entry thereof, to show good cause why the action should not be dismissed against Defendant Fary. More than twenty (20) days have elapsed and Plaintiff has not responded.¹ All claims against Defendant Fary will be dismissed without prejudice.

An appropriate Order shall issue.

It is so ORDERED.

Date: March 24, 2025
Richmond, Virginia



Henry E. Hudson
Senior United States District Judge

¹ Plaintiff sought a separate extension of time with respect to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss.